DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 563 SP 021 322

AUTHOR Carter, Heather L.; And Others
TITLE Teacher Educators: A Descriptive Study. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE May 81
GRANT OB-NIE-G-80-0116
NOTE 128p.; Subgrant of Program Division II, Research in Teaacher Education (RITE) Project No. P-6.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Choice; Educational Background; Family Characteristics; Higher Education; Job Satisfaction; Schools of Education; *Self Concept; Socioeconomic Status; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Educators; Teacher Qualifications; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This study reports on the characteristics of 28 tenured teacher educators in a department of curriculum and instruction. Two focused interviews were conducted with each participant in the spring of 1980 and the spring of 1981. Six research areas were investigated: (1) personal characteristics, family background including socioeconomic status, pre-collegiate educational experience, and perceived alternate career patterns both at entry to teacher education and at the present time; (2) undergraduate and graduate background; pre-collegiate teaching experience; and professional involvement as indicated by convention attendance, journal use, and collegial input; (3) perceived definition of a teacher educator, self-perceived role as a teacher educator, personal philosophy of teacher education, and ability or appropriateness of teacher educator's role; (4) teaching activities, scholarly contributions in research and publication, and local and national service to the profession; (5) personal, campus, and off-campus influences; and (6) perceived values of peers' activities, goals and desires, and most- and least-liked aspects of the teacher educator's role. Quantitative and qualitative data (quotations from individual interiews) are presented, and reflections are offered on significant trends within the data. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223563

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas

Final Report

TEACHER EDUCATORS: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

Subgrant of Program Division II
Research in Teacher Education (RITE)
Project No. P-6
Grant No. OB-NIE-G-80-0116

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. Bown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Project Director: Heather L. Carter
Division Coordinator: Gary Griffin
Center Director: Oliver H. Bown

Submitted to the
National Institute of Education
May, 1981

SP 021 322

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project would have been far different had it not been for the contributions of the two research assistants. Mark Isham and Roscoe Stribling spent endless hours in the preparation and conduct of the interviews, coding data, and reviewing text materials. Less measurable, but possibly more important contributions, were the ideas they brought, the trends they saw and the stimulation they provided. I have great respect for these two persons and value their contributions.

I also wish to thank the faculty members who willingly gave time from their tight schedules to engage in the interviews. All were cooperative.

The reviewing of draft reports by members of the Research and Development Center staff was valued. These people, too, are pressed for time but willingly helped with very little notice.

Rosemary Brant spent most of the summer of 1980 transcribing tapes. This was a tedious task but one she completed carefully with good humor. Several typists were involved at different phases of the project but Christy Palumbo and Mary Louise Francis are to be recognized for their help in the final stages.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION. 1

Research Questions 4
Procedures for the Investigation 5

WHO IS A TEACHER EDUCATOR?. 10

Quantitative Data 10
Qualitative Data 24
Reflections. 28

WHAT IS THE KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR A TEACHER EDUCATOR?. 30

Quantitative Data. 30
Qualitative Data 50
Reflections. 54

HOW DOES THE TEACHER EDUCATOR PERCEIVE HIS OR HER ROLE? 57

Quantitative Data. 57
Qualitative Data 62
Reflections. 66

WHAT DOES THE TEACHER EDUCATOR DO?. 67

Quantitative Data. 67
Qualitative Data 72
Reflections. 75

WHAT DOES A TEACHER EDUCATOR SEE AS SOURCES OF INFLUENCE UPON HIM OR HER? 77

Quantitative Data. 77
Qualitative Data 81
Reflections. 86

WHAT ARE THE PROFESSIONAL VALUES POSSESSED BY THE TEACHER EDUCATOR? 90

Quantitative Data. 90
Qualitative Data 101
Reflections. 106

CONCLUSIONS. 107

BIBLIOGRAPHY 111

APPENDIX A FIRST INTERVIEW GUIDE 112

APPENDIX B SECOND INTERVIEW GUIDE 117

APPENDIX C CONSENT FORMS 121

Considerable critical attention is currently being focused upon teacher education programs. Preservice preparation of teachers is under attack in that the graduates are perceived as being inadequately prepared in teaching skills when they undertake their initial full-time teaching responsibilities. Inservice programs are criticized because they lack relevancy and substance. In most instances, the brunt of the responsibility for the apparent failure is levelled at teacher educators. Little is known, however, of the background, values, goals, responsibilities, and instructional strategies of the teacher educator.

Since the 1960's, the classroom teacher has been the focus of many important studies. Philip Jackson (1968), in Life in Classrooms initiated this documentation. Dan Lortie published a detailed sociological study, The Schoolteacher (1975). More recently, Gary Fenstermacher has considered the intentions of teachers (1979). From these descriptive studies many hypotheses can be made regarding interactions in classrooms, explanations can be suggested regarding learning outcomes, and information can be derived for future planning. Indeed, these are rich sources of information for all persons who are concerned about the success of the public schools, yet no equivalent studies focus on teacher educators.

An invitational conference hosted by the Research and Development Center at The University of Texas at Austin and the National Institute of Education (1979) explored issues in teacher education which have potential for research. The first in a list of priorities

from that conference indicated the need for research on "teacher educators as practitioners." (Hall, 1979; iv).

As early as 1962 the National Society for the Study of Education prepared a yearbook entitled Education for the Professions (Henry, 1962). Howard Becker wrote a chapter in that yearbook (pp. 27-46) concerned with the nature of a profession. He suggested that a necessary question in determining the nature of any profession is ". . . what are in fact the characteristics of those work groups now regarded as professional?" (p. 33). Today the education profession, both at the collegiate and pre-collegiate level, is wrestling with the identification of professional standards. The description of the current characteristics of those who consider themselves to be teacher educators contained in this report may contribute to that process.

Guba and Clark (1978) have reported their concern for schools of education, colleges of education and collegiate departments of education. They discussed their concerns within the framework of an organization and suggested the need for greater understanding of conditions within the institutions. Some enlightenment could come from a consideration of the role of teacher educators within the organization.

Joyce et al. (1977) conducted a survey of the preservice preparation of teachers. This included a focus upon teacher educators in 240 universities, comprehensive colleges, and liberal arts institutions. The survey described the subjects'

- general characteristics and position
- salary
- prior experience
- acceptance of the current position
- activities
- competency based teacher education
- research
- perceptions of common pressures in their jobs
- faculty orientation toward educational philosophy
- faculty perception of improvement needed in teacher education

The data, however, were presented in a summary form for all institutions. Neither mapping among the variables considered nor an analysis according to type of institution was provided. The study does establish a valuable point of origin for research on teacher educators.

Dan Lortie's sociological study (1975) provides a "macropicture" (Glaser, 1979) of the person filling that role. The data for the study were collected from ninety-four individuals in the 1960's. Since many teacher educators have themselves been schoolteachers it seemed relevant, when observing teacher educators, to consider some of the variables investigated by Lortie in his study of teachers. The interview schedule he used (pp. 248-259), together with the survey conducted by Joyce, provide a basis for the present study.

A link can be made between the sociological approach employed by Lortie and that of the more traditional methodology employed by Joyce. These two approaches provided a basis for this descriptive study of teacher educators.

Six research questions were developed based on the literature. Answers to the questions were gained from two interviews. The data

generated were grouped into quantitative and qualitative categories and presented for each of the research questions. Reflections on the data were included. After all questions were discussed, conclusions of a broader type were presented together with suggestions for future research.

I. Research Questions

Six research questions were formulated for the investigation:

1. Who is a teacher educator?

This question was addressed by considering four main categories of interest:

   a. personal characteristics including age, sex, ethnicity and birthplace.
   b. family background including socioeconomic status.
   c. pre-collegiate educational experience.
   d. perceived alternate career patterns both at entry to teacher education and at the present time.

2. What is the knowledge base for a teacher educator?

   a. undergraduate and graduate background.
   b. pre-collegiate teaching experience.
   c. professional involvement including convention patterns, journal use and collegial input.
   d. process by which one learns to teach.

3. How does the teacher educator perceive his/her role?

   a. definition of a teacher educator and whether the individual recognizes himself/herself as a teacher educator or not.

b. philosophy for teacher education.

c. ability or appropriateness of role as a gate-keeper to the teaching profession.

4. What does the teacher educator do?

a. teaching activities.

b. scholarly contributions in research and publication.

c. service both locally and nationally.

5. What does a teacher educator see as sources of influence upon him/her?

a. personal influences.

b. campus influences.

c. off-campus influences.

6. What are the professional values possessed by the teacher educator?

a. teacher educators' perceived values of selected activities by (1) teacher educators and (2) the university.

b. stated goals and desires of teacher educators.

c. aspects of teacher educators' role in the university enjoyed most and least.

II. Procedures for the Investigation

A. Definition

A teacher educator was defined as a tenure track faculty member who had taught at least one undergraduate course designed for pre-service teachers within the academic year 1979-1980. Each faculty member held an appointment in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

The study was limited to tenure track faculty because it was considered that teaching assistants and assistant instructors are, first, graduate students and, second, faculty members who form a different population. Faculty members outside the Department of Curriculum and Instruction were not included in the study because of the extremely small representation from any single area. The responsibilities of faculty in different areas are considerably different from one another and also from those of teacher educators in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. Their inclusion could have created a potentially confounding influence yet would have been insufficient to have permitted for planned variation.

A broader definition of teacher educators would have included teacher educators at other types of institutions of higher education, in other departments of universities in school districts including cooperating teachers and staff development personnel, and in teacher centers.

B. Instrumentation

Focused interviews were used to elicit open-ended, detailed data. The focused interview, as described by Merton, et. al. (1956), is restricted in scope to a particular situation or setting. Use of the focused interview assumes the interviewee has developed specific hypotheses or assumptions concerning the consequences of determinant aspects of the situation that is to be explored. In constructing the interview, the interviewer develops a series of questions to explore the major areas of inquiry. These major areas provide criteria of relevance for the data to be obtained. Finally, the

interview itself is focused on the subjective experience of the interviwees in an effort to ascertain their definitions of the situation. It was believed that answers to the six major questions for this investigation could only be developed through an in-depth approach such as the focused interview. The six research questions formed the framework for the two interview guides that were developed. (Appendices A and B).

Training procedures for the interviewers were developed and conducted during the Fall of 1979. The training involved memorizing the interview guide for pilot tests. After each pilot interview, the interviewer analyzed hiw own interviewing technique. Corrective feedback was provided by other members of the project staff. Attempts were made to eliminate the tendency to ask closed convergent questions and to increase the amount of divergent questions and relevant transitions. Feedback was also given on effective methods of establishing rapport with an interviewee, introducing the intents and purposes of the interview, and reassuring the interviewee that the contents of the interview would remain confidential. Consistency between the two interviewers was considered achieved when scheduled questions were included in the same sequence with essentially the same wording. Training ceased when this level of consistency was reached.

C. Sample

The sample was composed of 28 persons who fitted the definition of teacher educator. All taught on one campus. One female associate professor refused to participate in the study because her workload at the time of the study required her to be out of town a consider-

able amount. Data from three persons were lost because of damaged tapes. Two persons were not involved in the second round interview because of tenure decisions directly involving them. All participants signed consent forms (Appendix C). Privacy of information was assured by ascribing a code number to the transcribed tape texts. All names and obvious identifying factors were omitted from the transcripts which were available to the principal investigator. The tapes themselves were never available to that person. Transcriptions were made by persons who had no contact with the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

D. Data Gathering Procedures

Two interviews, each of approximately one hour, were conducted with all persons in the study. The first was conducted during the Spring of 1980 and the second during the Spring of 1981. On both occasions the same interviewers were used. Each subject was interviewed by the same person on both occasions. Neither interviewer was known to the faculty members in the study in any other context.

All interviews were recorded on 60 minute cassette tapes. Since the tape recording is a semi-permanent record and the speaker is readily identifiable by anyone familiar with him or her, access to the tapes was restricted to the interviewer and the transcriber. The transcript was coded and obvious identifying features were eliminated.

E. Data Analysis

Data were analyzed by members of the project staff. Data which could be quantified were coded by two persons to insure reliability. All places of disagreement were discussed and necessary

changes were made. Constant discussion of the qualitative data for each of the research questions occurred.

Data for each of the six research questions will be presented in this report according to three categories:

a. quantitative data.

b. qualitative data - generally exerpted quotations from individual interviews.

c. selections pointing up significant trends within the data.

WHO IS A TEACHER EDUCATOR?

As a basis for the analysis of "Who is a teacher educator?", data were collected to cover a wide range of demographic factors which can be grouped into four broad categories. They are

a. personal characteristics including age, sex, ethnicity, and birthplace
b. family background including socioeconomic status, sibling order, parental education, and parental occupation
c. precollegiate education experience
d. perceived alternate career options both at entry to teacher education and at the present time

Postsecondary academic background and school teaching experience will not be considered in this section since specifics of these more appropriately fit in the discussion of the knowledge base of teacher educators. However, it is interesting to note that all but one had received a doctoral degree; the one who had not, held a master's degree with additional coursework.

First, quantitative data will be reported and the model university teacher educator, as depicted by this sample, will be described. Next, qualitative data will be presented, and finally reflections will be made upon the data.

I. Quantitative Data

A. Personal Characteristics

Complete data were collected from twenty-eight faculty members who fitted the definition of teacher educator--a tenure track faculty member who had taught at least one undergraduate course designed for preservice teachers within the last calendar year. Each faculty member held an appointment in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. Of these twenty-eight persons, eighteen were male and ten female. The vast majority (24) was Anglo with one black, two Hispanic, and one Asian American. All of the minorities worked at the elementary level and had received their doctorates since 1969. The age distribution was five persons aged 31-35 years, ten persons aged 36-40 years, four aged 41-45, and nine persons over 45 years. Table 1 summarizes these age data for the whole sample and selected subsamples. Of the sample interviewed, ten persons were born in the Midwest, six in the State of Texas, and the remainder in other regions of the United States. None was foreign born (Table 2).

B. Family Background

The teacher educators were asked to characterize the socioeconomic status of the community in which they grew up. No formal method of status assignment was employed. In instances when the respondent stated "lower," "middle," or "upper" their responses were so categorized. When a person indicated between one level and another, they were assigned to "low to middle" or to "middle to upper" (Table 3). The data indicate that most teacher educators come from the low to middle or middle socioeconomic status (13 low to middle and 11 middle). A trend toward

TABLE 1

Age Distributions

N = 28

Age Range	Total	M	F	ap	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All level
20-25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26-30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31-35	5	3	2	3	2	0	0	5	2	1	2
36-40	10	6	4	3	7	0	2	8	7	1	2
41-45	4	2	2	1	3	0	1	3	4	1	1
Over 45	9	7	2	1	4	4	7	1	7	0	0

TABLE 2

Regions in United States When Born

N = 28

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Texas	6	4	2	3	2	1	2	3	5	0	1
Southwest*	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Southeast	3	3	0	1	2	0	0	3	1	1	1
Northeast	3	2	1	0	3	0	0	3	3	0	0
Midwest	10	6	4	4	4	2	4	6	5	2	3
Western Plains	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Pacific W	3	2	1	0	3	0	1	2	3	0	0
Pacific NW	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0

*Excluding Texas

TABLE 3

Estimated Socioeconomic Status During Childhood

N = 28

SES	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Low	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	0
Low to middle	13	8	5	3	8	2	7	5	9	2	2
Middle	11	7	4	3	7	1	2	9	7	1	3
Middle to Upper	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Upper	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0

a slightly higher socioeconomic background was observed among more recent doctoral recipients (Table 3).

Most members of the sample came from family units with more than one child - three children families being the most frequent. Within the family grouping, most were either the first or the second born (Table 4). Parental educational background varied considerably. Two persons, both males, were from families in which a parent (the father) held a doctorate (Tables 5 and 6). Most frequently the father was a blue collar worker (13). Nine of those sampled had fathers representing a profession, five of whom were educators (Table 7). Seventeen of the persons interviewed stated that their mothers had always been occupied as housewives. Three stated that their mothers had been educators (Table 8).

C. Precollegiate Educational Experience

Twenty-two members of the sample attended public school for all of their precollegiate education. Four attended church affiliated schools for grades 1-12. One parochial school student transferred to a public school for the senior high grades. One person made numerous changes hence classification was impossible. The general trend in the United States for consolidated schools at the high school levels is reflected in the change from attendance at primarily rural or suburban schools for the elementary grades to urban settings for both the junior and senior high school levels.

TABLE 4

Summary Birth Order for Sample*

N = 28

Birth Order	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
1st	14	9	5	5	8	1	4	10	8	2	4
2nd	9	6	3	2	4	3	4	4	8	1	0
3rd	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0
4th	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
5th	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
6th	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Family size was as follows:

Number of Children	Frequency
1	6
2	6
3	9
4	4
5	2
6	1

TABLE 5

Father's Educational Level

N = 28

Level	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
No formal schooling	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	0
1-6 yrs.	3	2	1	0	3	0	1	2	3	0	0
7-9 yrs.	5	4	1	1	4	0	1	4	4	0	1
10-12 yrs.	4	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	4	0	0
Vocational* Training	4	3	1	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	0
College work	3	3	0	1	2	0	2	1	3	0	0
Undergraduate degree	4	1	3	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	2
Graduate work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Master's degree	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Doctoral degree	2	2	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2

*Refers to postsecondary level

TABLE 6

Mother's Educational Level

N = 28

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
No formal schooling	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	0
1-6 yrs.	4	3	1	0	4	0	2	2	4	0	0
7-9 yrs.	4	3	1	1	3	0	1	3	3	0	1
10-12 yrs.	5	4	1	1	3	1	3	2	4	0	1
Vocational* training	7	4	3	3	3	1	2	5	3	3	1
College work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undergraduate degree	3	1	2	0	2	1	1	2	2	0	1
Graduate work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Master's degree	3	2	1	2	1	0	0	2	2	0	1
Doctoral degree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Refers to postsecondary level

TABLE 7

Father's Occupation

N = 28

Occupation	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Educator	5	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2
Professional	4	4	0	1	3	0	1	3	3	0	1
Other white collar	3	1	2	1	2	0	0	3	2	0	1
Farmer	3	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	0	0
Blue collar	13	10	3	3	8	2	5	8	10	2	1

TABLE 8

Mother's Occupation

N = 28

Occupation	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Educator	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	1
Professional	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Housewife	17	11	6	4	10	3	8	9	13	1	3
Other white collar	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Other blue collar	6	5	1	3	3	0	1	5	4	2	0

At all grade levels, the majority of the sample members described the population of the schools they attended as being either completely or primarily Anglo. The vast majority (23 at the elementary level, 22 at the junior high and 26 at the senior high level) indicated that their personal impression of school was favorable. Most were able to describe individual teachers at various levels who had influenced them greatly.

D. Perceived Alternate Career Patterns

Two direct questions were asked relating to perceived alternate career options. The first related to alternate occupations available to them when they first decided to pursue an advanced degree in order to become a teacher educator. Table 9 displays the data related to this question. Not all persons responded owing to their difficulty identifying the time when they decided to become a teacher educator. At that stage of their career many saw themselves as having an alternate career possibility which would have made them upwardly mobile.

Table 10 displays the data from another direct question, "What would you do now if you were to lose your job because of budgetary constraints and not because of your own competence?" These data indicated that few alternatives were perceived as being available. Essentially one half (14) of the sample indicated that they would pursue the same occupation at another institution, or that they would get a closely related position. That was particularly true

TABLE 9

Career Options Available Upon Entry to Teacher Education

N = 23

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
No other option*	9	5	4	3	5	1	5	3	6	1	2
Blue collar job	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
White collar job	3	1	2	0	3	0	0	3	3	0	0
Another profession**	4	4	0	1	2	1	1	3	3	0	1
More than one	5	2	3	1	4	0	1	4	4	0	1

*Includes remaining in occupation at time of decision
**Excluding teaching

TABLE 10

Summary Data on Career Options Available at Present Time

N = 25

Current Options	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
No option*	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Business	3	3	0	1	1	1	2	1	2	0	1
Self-employment**	2	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1
School teaching	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	0
Another profession	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Another faculty position	9	7	2	3	5	1	4	5	6	1	2
More than one	7	5	2	2	5	0	1	6	5	1	1

*Only option available would be as university based teacher educator.
**Includes writing and consulting.

of those persons receiving their doctorate prior to 1970.

E. The "Typical" Teacher Educator

Although there is no such thing as a typical teacher educator, a modal person for this group can be described.

Sex	Male
Age	36-40 years
Ethnicity	Anglo
Siblings	Three
Family order	First
Father's occupation	Blue collar
Father's education level	High school
Mother's occupation	Housewife
Mother's education level	Vocational school
Family socio-economic status	Low to middle
Type of undergraduate school	Small public
Undergraduate major	Elementary education
Number of years as a school teacher	Two
Level of school teaching	Elementary or more than one level
Professiorial rank	Associate professor

The limited reference group biases this description. If a broader definition of teacher educator had been used, or if a sample had been employed with equivalent numbers of secondary and elementary level faculty, then a different distribution might have been observed.

II. Qualitative Data

A. Personal Characteristics

Most of the members of the group expressed a general satisfaction with themselves during their pre-collegiate years. They

described successful social and academic experiences. The Anglo majority, at least until their high school years, interacted only with their own ethnic group.

B. Family Background

Members of the sample expressed a high level of parental support for them throughout school. The support can be categorized in three ways:

1. Implied expectations

> "They (parents) more or less expected that it (homework) should be done. I could tell although I don't recall them even having said anything. I could tell that they were pleased with the work that I'd been doing and that they valued my grades."

2. Expectation to achieve maximum possible for the individual

> "We want you to do the best you can - we won't be disappointed if you don't make top grades or anything of that nature, but we want you to do the very best you possibly can." "We expect that you will do the best you can and we don't really care what your grades are so long as we feel that you're doing the best work that you can do."

3. Overt support

> "My mother encouraged us to read. . .But of course I loved school and my mother had readied me, you know we were so ready for school it was unbelievable."
>
> "I had always heard my folks say that I was going to college."
>
> "And they (parents) recognized the value of education themselves, and certainly were insistent that my brother and I apply ourselves in school and maintain appropriate behavior and other kinds of things in school. Education was very important."

C. Precollegiate School Experience

When reflecting back upon their attitudes toward their precollegiate school experience, teacher educators generally conveyed either positive or neutral reactions. The positive ones were reflected in statements such as:

> "I enjoyed the elementary school very much. I can remember almost all the teachers. . . I loved highschool, I thoroughly enjoyed it. . .I remember many of my teachers and have kept in contact with some of them right down to the present."

Less frequent were neutral attitudes which were easily captured in statements such as:

> "I never minded school. I don't remember it being the highlight of my life, but I never minded school."

Far less frequent were statements such as the general picture of elementary school conveyed by one faculty member.

> "It was traumatic I would say. . .When I say traumatic I'm really suggesting the idea that I was on the shuffle so much that I felt a bit insecure and a bit tentative in my school environment because I was meeting new kids regularly."

Comments such as these were made by two or three of the sample whose childhood had been marked with far less stability than that which characterized the rest of the group.

When reflecting back upon their precollegiate experience, several persons commented upon their own attitude toward the academic expectations in school.

> "In the elementary school I remember always being concerned about the academics. . . .In junior high school I just remember doing a lot of homework. I think I was bored a great deal of the time in high school but at the same time I wanted to do very well."

This competitiveness to meet the standards academically in high school was constantly reiterated.

In general, one can summarize the precollegiate school experiences of the group as enjoyable with concern for academic activities and involvement in the social life of the school. Academic accomplishment appeared to be of high value to the teacher educators whether or not it was overtly stated as a goal by their parents.

D. Perceived Alternate Career Patterns

Although the group of persons interviewed did not follow the anticipated path of a single graduate school, they did follow the anticipated pattern with respect to limited work experience, most of the sample had no full time work experience other than that of teaching prior to becoming a full time university faculty member.

There were some exceptions to that trend. One person who had gone straight through school, undergraduate college and graduate school for a master's degree, and who had followed that with two years teaching experience, felt that at that juncture it was necessary to have a different work experience. In response to being asked, "Why did you leave teaching?" that person said that "There were two

reasons and they were equally important. One is that I felt I had just been in school forever, I mean all my life I was either a student or a teacher. The second was that I was ready for a change in geographical location." The two changes were made at the same time - location and employment. The same person, when discussing changes desired in a teacher preparation program, stated"...it would involve not certifying undergraduates for classroom teaching. It would involve coming back to get a teaching degree after doing something else for a while."

The limited earlier work experiences of the teacher educators interviewed may result in the perceptions they hold that they have very limited alternate career options later in their professional life. The lack of options may, alternatively, be a function of the somewhat specialized preparation they have experienced beginning with the undergraduate period.

III. Reflections

The teacher educators interviewed in this study reflect *an homogenous group which has essentially the same characteristics as schoolteachers.* The background of the individuals is very similar to that sketched by Lortie (1975).

One concern that derives from this Anglo, middle class background of the faculty members is their lack of interaction with other cultural and ethnic groups. *Since these experiences are*

missing and cannot be imposed during the doctoral program, some formal work in sociology might be of value. This would probably help teacher educators to understand the environments and the organizations in which the teachers they are preparing will work.

WHAT IS THE KNOWLEDGE BASE OF THE TEACHER EDUCATOR?

Data to address this question were generated by both the first and second interviews. Four major thrusts were pursued in the analysis:

a. undergraduate and graduate background

b. precollegiate teaching experience

c. professional involvement including convention attendance patterns, journal use, and collegial input

d. process by which one learns to teach.

I. Quantitative Data

A. Undergraduate and Graduate Background

One major component of the knowledge base for teacher educators is the organized coursework acquired in an institution of higher education. Table 11 displays data related to undergraduate major. The majority (nineteen of the twenty eight teacher educators interviewed) earned a degree with a major outside a college or department of education. This pattern held at all three levels -- elementary, secondary, and all level. The trend could be observed strongly among those persons receiving their doctorates since 1969. The members of this subsample had not personally experienced a teacher preparation program similar to the one in which they were currently teaching.

TABLE 11

Summary Data for Undergraduate Major

N = 28

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Elementary education	8	4	4	1	6	1	4	4	8	0	0
Secondary education	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Science	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	0
Math	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
English/ linguistics	4	2	2	1	3	0	0	4	3	0	1
Social science	6	6	0	2	2	2	4	2	4	0	2
Fine Arts	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Double Major	5	3	2	1	3	1	2	3	2	2	1

When one considers the graduate work of the people interviewed a pattern of attendance at more than one graduate school emerged. These data are presented in Table 12. The trend is particularly obvious among males, associate professors, and faculty at the elementary level.

Data from postsecondary experience indicate that the teacher educators interviewed did not follow a pattern of undergraduate major in education, master's degree while teaching, and doctorate degree at the same institution. Such a pattern would probably have been hypothesized without these data. There was a great amount of emphasis on academic background as an undergraduate.

B. Precollegiate Teaching Experience

A second assumed knowledge base for teacher educators is schoolteaching experience. The profession places high value on the role of practitioner as reflected in requirements for appointment as faculty in teacher education institutions.

Of the twenty eight teacher educators interviewed only one had no school teaching experience. That person's assignment as a faculty member did not involve a field assignment. The majority of the sample members had between two and six years of school teaching experience prior to their becoming teacher educators. These data are presented in Table 13. A markedly different trend can be observed between those persons who received their doctorates before 1970 and those since that time. In the first group seven of the ten members had taught for four years or more, while in the

TABLE 13

Years of Experience as a School Teacher

N = 28

Number of years	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
2	8	4	4	2	6	0	2	6	6	0	2
3	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	0	1
4	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
5	5	4	1	0	3	2	4	1	4	1	0
6	4	3	1	2	2	0	1	2	3	1	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
More than 8	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0

TABLE 12

Number of Graduate Schools Attended

N = 28

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
1	9	4	5	4	5	0	2	6	7	1	1
2	15	12	3	3	9	3	7	8	10	1	4
3	3	1	2	1	2	0	0	3	2	1	0
4	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0

second group only six of the seventeen had had that length of public school teaching experience. Another considerable difference was observed between the males, of whom eleven of eighteen had taught four years or more, and the females, of whom only three of the ten had taught for four years or more. These two sets of observations are compatible in that more females (7) have received their doctorate since 1969 than before 1970 (2). These data are presented in Table 14.

Each faculty member was identified as having primary responsibility for teaching undergraduates in the elementary sequence, the secondary sequence, or both. The latter category was labeled "all level." At both the elementary and secondary levels, school teaching experience had been at the same level as that for which they were responsible as teacher educators. For those persons working at all levels, this was not the case. In two instances all of the school teaching experience had been at the senior high level. These data are presented in Table 15. Another slight deviation occurred in the group receiving their doctorates since 1969 -- they generally had teaching experiences at more than one level.

Table 16 displays the data related to the socioeconomic status (SES) of students taught at the precollegiate level. SES was defined only by the estimate of the person being interviewed. None indicated that they had taught exclusively in an upper SES

TABLE 14

Sex of Sample Members

N = 28

Sex	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Male	18	18	0	4	10	4	8	10	12	2	4
Female	10	0	10	4	6	0	2	7	8	1	1

TABLE 15

Level of Schoolteaching Experience

N = 28

Grade levels taught	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
1-6	11	6	5	3	6	2	6	5	11	0	0
7-8	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
9-12	4	4	0	2	2	0	0	4	1	1	2
More than one	11	8	3	1	8	2	4	6	8	1	2
None	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

TABLE 16

Socioeconomic Level of Schools at Which Taught

N = 24

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Lower	5	3	2	3	2	0	1	4	4	1	0
Lower to middle	4	3	1	1	2	1	1	3	4	0	0
Middle	3	3	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	3
Middle to upper	4	3	1	1	3	0	1	3	3	1	0
Upper	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wide Range	8	4	4	1	4	3	6	1	6	1	1

setting. Individuals who received their doctorates prior to 1970 expressed having had experiences with a wider range of SES schools.

Table 17 indicates the type of community in which the members of the sample had taught. The majority had taught in urban schools and only one person had taught in a specifically inner city school. Persons who received their doctorates prior to 1970 had more varied experiences than the more recent degree recipients.

Assuming that public schoolteaching is a necessary experience for teacher educators, all of the participants in this study satisfied the requirement. Their experiences were of reasonable duration and at the appropriate level.

C. Professional Involvement

A third source of knowledge for teacher educators is the ongoing influence of professional organizations. The primary means of gaining and utilizing knowledge from this source are three: through association membership, convention attendance, and journal subscription and use.

Faculty members were asked, "Are there any conventions you attend regularly on a yearly basis?" This question addressed itself to both regional and national conventions as well as special interest and general conventions. Table 18 presents responses to this question. The majority of the respondents attend two or three conventions per year. There is a slight increase in the frequency of convention attendance by persons in more senior rank and by those who received their doctorate prior to 1970.

TABLE 17

Type of Community in Which Schoolteaching Experience Occurred

N = 27

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Rural	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Urban	15	12	3	3	11	1	3	12	12	1	2
Suburban	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
Inner-city	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
More than one	8	4	4	1	4	3	6	1	6	1	1

TABLE 18

Number of Conventions Attended Per Year

N = 18

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
1	3	1	2	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	1
2	6	2	4	3	3	0	2	3	5	1	0
3	5	2	3	0	5	0	2	3	5	0	0
4	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0
More than 4	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	1

As supported by clarifying questions, this is a function of ability to afford the expenses and the freer schedules of those of more senior rank. Conventions were categorized into two types; subject specialization, such as The National Council for the Teacher of English, and general, such as The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. There seems to be a trend among the more recent graduates, the females, and faculty who teach courses in the elementary sequence to attend more specialized conferences rather than those of more general interest. These data are presented in Table 19. To a great extent this may be the result of the disproportionate number of members within the sample teaching in the reading and language arts areas where activities within the special interest area are prized.

Similar questions were asked regarding the number and type of journals read on a regular basis. These data are presented in Table 20. The number of journals read appears to be consistent across all variables considered. There is a considerable difference, however, when one considers the type of journal read. Those persons who received their doctorates since 1969 report they read more specialized journals than those who received their doctorates at an earlier date. These data are presented in Table 21.

It seemed reasonable that the extent and composition of one's collegial network would influence the knowledge base of teacher educators. Tables 22 and 23 display the data related to these

TABLE 19

Type of Conventions Attended

N = 18

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Completely specialist	5	1	4	3	2	0	1	3	3	1	1
Primarily specialist	7	4	3	0	6	1	3	4	7	0	0
Mixed	4	3	1	1	2	1	2	2	3	0	1
Primarily general	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	0
Completely general	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 20

Number of Journals Read on Regular Basis

N = 19

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
1	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	1
2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	0
3	5	3	2	2	3	0	3	2	4	1	0
4	4	2	2	0	3	1	2	2	4	0	0
5	6	4	2	1	3	2	3	3	5	0	1

TABLE 21

Summary Data of Types of Journals Read

N = 20

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Completely specialized	8	4	4	3	4	1	1	6	7	0	1
Primarily specialized	7	4	3	1	5	1	4	3	7	0	0
Mixed	4	2	2	1	2	1	3	1	2	1	1
Primarily general	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Completely general	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 22

Extent of Collegial Network

N = 16

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Large	4	3	1	0	1	3	3	1	3	0	1
Expanding	6	5	1	1	5	0	2	4	6	0	0
Limited	5	1	4	3	2	0	2	2	4	1	0
None	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0

TABLE 23

Source of Network Development

N = 17

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Fellow students	2	2	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	0
Former students	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Convention meetings	5	2	3	3	2	0	0	5	4	1	0
Common research	4	3	1	0	3	1	2	2	4	0	0
More than one	5	3	2	0	3	2	4	1	4	0	1

factors. These data were based to a considerable extent upon inferences from several responses rather than one single question. Their use must, therefore, be highly speculative. Most of the respondents described an expanding professional network. An interesting feature of the data is the contrast between the responses from males and females. It would appear that the males avail themselves of wider collegial networks than females. This does not appear to be associated with recency of degree or rank. Most persons suggested that their source of network is through either a common research base or convention meetings. Few of the small sample suggested that the source of their network is either fellow students from graduate school or former mentors.

D. Process by Which One Learned to Teach

A fourth knowledge base for teacher educators was thought to be the process by which they perceived that they had learned to teach. A direct question, "How did you learn to teach?" was posed. Table 24 summarizes the responses to this question. The two categories of "by doing it" and "modeling" were among the most frequently mentioned. None of the participants indicated they acquired the ability through reading. Only three said they gained their expertise specifically through education coursework. All of the last group were females who taught students interested in elementary teaching.

From these quantitative data the sources of a knowledge base among teacher educators appear diverse and seem to lack organi-

TABLE 24

Process by Which Individuals Learned to Teach

N = 20

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
By doing it	6	4	2	1	4	0	2	4	5	0	1
Education coursework	3	0	3	1	2	0	1	2	3	0	0
Modelling	4	2	2	0	3	0	2	2	3	0	1
Reading	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	3	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	0
More than one	4	3	1	1	3	0	2	1	3	0	1

zation. The extent of content specialization among teacher educators appears to be increasing in recent years.

II. Qualitative Data

A. Undergraduate and Graduate Background

Little qualitative data were collected with respect to this phase of the knowledge base for teacher educators and that which was gained provided no significant trends.

B. Precollegiate Teaching Experience

A major consideration in the first interview was the reason for leaving the public school classroom. The majority of the people made the change apparently because an opportunity presented itself.

> "Look you've got all these courses. They all transfer. They're all going to count. You're just a step away from a doctorate. Here's some more support. I thought I'm almost there - why not?"

Only one expressed a lifetime desire.

> "I always wanted to teach in a college or at a university, always, as long as I remember."

Several indicated that they left public school teaching because of a strong desire to get away from the routine that existed there.

> "Well it was a chance to get out of the classroom - the routine that had really been bugging me." "I just felt so constricted by the time frame . . . I just started to feel very tied down, and very much in a routine as far as my time was concerned. The kids were never routine, but I felt constricted . . . I was always

> physically tired and mentally tired after a day--it's a very tiring job."

Several expressed a desire to help a broader population than they could in a school classroom.

> "My first intent, in my doctoral program, was to move from the role of teacher to principal. My thinking was that if I could serve in the role of principal, then, instead of influencing just children, I could influence faculty. Therefore, I could bring about changes in entire faculties that would influence larger numbers of children . . . But I did not get hired as a principal. That led me to say, 'Another way I can influence teachers is through the training process, through the education of teachers'."

> " I saw it was an opportunity to provide for my family better than I could as a teacher."

The reasons for making the career move were not related to a dislike of teaching as such, in fact there was a common love of teaching. Rather, reasons cited for changing careers arose from constraints within the classroom or the desire to have greater influence on the quality of the teaching profession.

C. Professional Involvement

The amount of knowledge exchanged among these teacher educators is less than one might expect. Collegial interaction on campus appears to be limited. Conversations do not normally concern professional activities.

> "It's fairly limited within the university. Even when you have an informal activity with someone. . . You tend not to talk about professional activities. . .It's more social conversation."

Some persons indicated they sensed a considerable amount of

competition among the faculty members on the campus - a factor which partially accounts for the limited amount of communication among faculty members.

> "Until people are willing to say 'Well let's do a major study together and you do it the way you want and I will look at it the way I want', then it is not going to happen. And for some reason people who are already entrenched in the profession seem not to want to look at things or not to want to share things with people who might take a different viewpoint. Now I might be all wrong."

One person presented a similar viewpoint and indicated how damaging such an attitude is to the institution. That person also stated he felt the competitive attitude not to be unique to the institution in which the investigation occurred.

> "The culture of the college is such that it deprecates anybody standing out. It fosters mediocrity in intellectual affairs. . . Now it is too damaging to talk about what anyone does in a scholarly way. This raises questions - internal, personal questions about one's efficacy as a professor for those who don't do anything."

Several persons made comparisons between the collegial support that they receive on the campus and that which they receive through professional organizations and other contacts. In general, they mentioned they received a greater amount of collegial support and information from off campus.

> "Not so much in my own university because in my area of research . . . Until recently, I was the individual responsible for much of the research in that area and I've probably been more inclined to talk about my research with people who are researching in the same area

> at other institutions, and to share materials with them. On occasions I have conversations with our own faculty . . . But they're very busy, and there tends not to be too much communication going on among our own faculty."

Frequent interaction of a sustained type is described to occur through national conventions.

> "I go to conventions probably for the communication, the dialogue that exists among colleagues, people that I've known over the years. I do get together with many of them at these conferences and we discuss our research interests, our profession and so on."

It seems unfortunate that the potentially large knowledge base available through collegial interaction on one's own campus is not present due to either lack of time or competitiveness.

D. Process by Which One Learned to Teach

The majority of the participants stated that they learned to teach by either teaching or by studying models of good teachers.

> "Just by doing it, basically I would say that. Mostly by doing it - Failing, redoing it, and also watching some people that I thought were good teachers' modeling behaviors."

> "Trial and error". *"Do you think that's pretty common?"* "Yes I think probably 95% of the learning is like that."

> "I think by modeling people more than anything else."

Since most of these people learned to teach through the act of teaching and not through any structured classroom leaning one is led to wonder how they propose to teach others or whether in fact they believe one can teach others to teach.

There appear to be two main groups of faculty members with respect to this comparison. One group believes that one is able and should be teaching skills to the preservice teachers.

> "I believe we can help teach the technical aspects of teaching. Personally I don't think that we can do much with 90% of what the person is all about. I think 90% of teaching is definitely an art."

> "There's just not enough time to teach people to teach, for one thing. So we can only teach them to be aware of the variables of concern when you teach. You can teach them to be aware of things like management."

The second group of faculty is concerned with the more humanistic side of teaching.

> "Try to help them to think, and try to get them to read, and make sure they can write and are comfortable with the process. Treat them like adults."

A few persons believed that teaching is a developmental process.

> "The question assumes by its verb that I know how. I continue to learn how . . . "

Apparently there is not a satisfaction with the notion of purely learning as an apprentice - there is a need to teach some content but there is little agreement about that content.

III. Reflections

Four major themes derive from this investigation related to the knowledge base of the teacher educator.

First, the knowledge base currently for teaching educators is diffuse. There is little common agreement regarding either

a central core of information or the procedures for teaching it. Etzioni (1969) has suggested that one requirement for a profession is a common core of information. Teacher educators now appear to be developing some common body of knowledge which is supported by research. *The attempt to develop some conceptual framework or frameworks for teacher education is important.*

Second, the trend observed within this group to hold an undergraduate major outside education is one which seems to be of value if teacher educators are to consider themselves members of a profession. Etzioni, in the preface to The Semi-Professions and Their Organizations, indicates that highly specialized knowledge is a mark of a profession. With an undergraduate major in an academic area, several years teaching experience in various locations, and considerable advanced graduate work in education and related fields *the status of a profession may be claimed by teacher educators.*

Third, organizations generally thrive through mutual and consistent sharing of interests, activities, and problems. The support system offered by such interaction on a daily basis is invaluable. The persons interviewed appear to gain most of their support and most of their impetus for the advancement of knowledge from outside the organization with which they are associated on a daily basis. In fact there appear to be collegial patterns on the campus which are counter productive. *Perhaps one impediment to the advancement of knowledge about teacher preparation is the*

lack of a sustained collegial interaction on the university campus.

Fourth, professional contacts across the nation are highly prized as a means of supporting specific research interests. Any single university is bound to be limited in the number of people having the same specialized research interests, hence only from outside can one expect to gain impetus for these special interests. Only in a national arena can specialized theories be tested. *The national professional networks appear essential for the support of specialized areas of interest and knowledge.*

HOW DOES THE TEACHER EDUCATOR PERCEIVE HIS OR HER ROLE?

The effectiveness with which an individual functions in an organization is positively correlated with the degree of clarity with which that individual perceives his or her role. Consequently, to determine the role of the teacher educator is critical. In this study participants were asked to indicate:

a. their definition of a teacher educator and whether they recognized themselves as members of the group.
b. their philosophy for teacher education
c. their ability or appropriateness as a gatekeeper to the teaching profession.

I. Quantitative Data

A. Definition of a Teacher Educator

For this study the term "teacher educator" was narrowly defined by the investigator in order to facilitate data collection and to permit homogeneity of sample - a necessary characteristic since the number of persons involved was small. Greater heterogenity would have been acquired had one included professors of the liberal arts who teach required non-professional courses for the preservice teachers or persons in the public schools who act as cooperating teachers and guide one phase of the preservice experience closely. With the homogeneity of the sample it was assumed that no person would have difficulty identifying himself or herself as a teacher

educator. This assumption, however, was not completely accurate. Eight of the participants did not view their role as a teacher educator as their primary role. The unwillingness of two of these persons appeared to be a manifestation of semantic dissociation - they did not wish to be labelled as teacher educators. Five persons identified themselves more specifically with terms such as reading teacher educator or science teacher educator.

B. Philosophy for Teacher Education

An assumption for this portion of the study was that if one has a clearly defined philosophy of the field within which one is working, then role definition will probably have greater clarity. In the second interview the question, "What is your philosophy for teacher education?" was posed. The fifteen responses given to this question were categorized by the investigators as well-defined, somewhat defined, or vague. Table 25 displays the results of this analysis. Those persons who consider teacher education, rather than a content specialization, to be their primary role are markedly different from those who have the reverse emphasis. It does not appear that either length of time since receipt of the doctorate or the length of time served as a public school teacher influences the level of clarity.

C. Ability or Appropriateness as a Gatekeeper to the Teaching Profession

Considerable discussion has taken place in recent years regarding who should act as gatekeeper to the teaching profession -

TABLE 25

Clarity of Philosophy for Teacher Education

N = 15

	Total	Teacher Educator Primary Role	Teacher Educator Not Primary Role	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Schoolteacher* More than 4 years	Schoolteacher* Less than 5 years
Well defined	5	4	1	2	3	2	3
Somewhat defined	8	5	3	4	4	4	3
Vague	2	1	1	0	2	0	2

*One case is not reported due to no teaching experience

who should control credentialling. Historically, this has rested in the universities and state agencies. Recently, however, there has been increasing pressure to transfer this authority to teacher groups. Related to this issue were two questions asked of university-based teacher educators:

1. Do you feel it is your responsibility to advise a student not to enter the teaching profession if he or she is not qualified?
2. Are you able to prevent an unqualified candidate from receiving certification?

There was a unanimous and positive response to the first question. The second question, however, yielded the information presented in Table 26. The terms "power" and "influence" were distinguished. The ability to prevent a person from entering the teaching profession was designated as "power." "Influence" refers to a more limited ability to engage in non-binding counseling or persuasion. The data in Table 26 show that one either perceived oneself as having power to prevent entry or having no power. Few individuals saw themselves in the counseling role. The bimodal distribution was apparent across all variables with the exception of that of length of time employed as a schoolteacher. Generally, those who had taught for more than four years saw themselves as having the power to determine entry; those with four years experience or less did not perceive that power.

TABLE 26

Teacher Educator's Perception of Role as a Gatekeeper

N = 25

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	School teacher More than 4 yrs.	School teacher Less than 5 yrs.
Power	10	6	4	3	5	2	3	6	7	3
Influence	4	3	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	3
None	11	6	5	4	6	1	5	6	2	9

II. Qualitative Data

A. Definition of Teacher Educator

Few persons interviewed in this sample had crystallized a definition of a teacher educator. The person who said, "I never thought about it.", probably summed up most participants' inattention.

Definitions provided by the participants fall into three categories:

1. Purveyors of procedures

> "...someone who is really good at methods, who can teach the undergraduate how to do things, how to teach reading, how to do math, and how to do science."

2. Job description

> "I suppose that is someone who teaches in an education department at a university. He gets hired! I mean, in terms of the real world, that's basically it."

3. Role as a professional

> "A person who commits him or herself to the improvement of instruction and takes on responsibility to improve instruction in schools."

The frequency with which members of the sample reflected the notion of having paper credentials which satisfied a job requirement was high. This may be telling when placed in juxtaposition to the few who reflected a professional concern for the development of the teaching profession.

B. Philosophy for teacher education

> "I am convinced that there is more than one

> appropriate philosophy for teacher education. I am concerned about those people who have no definable philosophy, who fly by the seat of their pants, who jump here and there and everywhere and do not know what they stand for. I think that several orientations would work and provide for good teacher education, but individuals must be very clear where they stand, where they are coming from, where they are going, and how they are going to get there."

The teacher educators interviewed reflected different orientations but many failed to articulate a clearly defined philosophy. The person who said,

> "My philosophy of teacher education? That's too vague, I don't know what that means. I don't know what my philosophy is."

stated overtly what many others implied.

The philosophies stated could generally be classified into three categories:

1. Humanistic

> "It is the task of the teacher educator to impart somehow or other to students or potential teachers that curricula encompass the world and that the way to impart curricula is . . . to recognize that the inhabitants of the world are in your classroom. And that is a very hard thing to do . . . I tell my students that the world is at their disposal and that particularly in the language arts, reading, writing, speaking, and listening, humankind's accomplishments are all appropriate to be in the classroom."

2. Psychological

> "It is important to help people think better, and if you have people who think clearly they might be able to help other people think clearly. So, I think what we are engaged in is helping people think better as opposed to just getting them to do certain things."

> "I really don't know how to state directly my philosophy for teacher education. I would want it to produce teachers who know the content which they are expected to teach and enough about children of the age level which they are going to teach. I would want it to produce teachers who could make decisions about how to teach that content to those children and who could maintain the children's confidence and the children's sense of themselves."

3. Instructional

> "I think the nature of the training ought to be a lot more direct and directive. I think we need to tell students how to do something, model what we tell, and let them practice it . . . . The model is really important. I think they need to practice because it increases the credibility of the model . . . . Then I think we ought to have some further way of stimulating generalizations . . . . There needs to be opportunity for the students to do specific things that they weren't taught to do."

These statements certainly do not provide a complete statement of philosophy. Rather, they are statements of what is valued or what are the expected actions of the individuals. Generally, one could conclude that there was an absence of a well defined philosophy of a formal nature and none of the group cited any theoretical or research framework for the philosophy or the viewpoints held.

C. Ability or Appropriateness as Gatekeeper to the Teaching Profession

The majority of participants in response to the question, "Are you able to prevent an unqualified candidate from receiving certification?" gave terse answers of "yes" or "no." Samples of

the more expanded comments are included below.

1. Power to prevent

> "I think it is my responsibility to encourage those who are interested in continuing and it is my responsibility to discourage those who are not really interested in continuing . . . . I have always tried to talk the person into withdrawing but if he doesn't, that person usually fails . . . . It is my individual judgment."

2. Influence by counseling

> "I have prevented some students from becoming teachers, but not because I was able to say to someone, 'Do not certify him.' I was able to convince the students that perhaps there were other options open to them that they had not thought about and I have tried to sell them on the idea of getting out."

3. Essentially no

> "Do I feel it's my responsibility? Yes, but it's hard to do . . . . These kids are so young and I only see them for five or six months . . . . They can change . . . . I really get scared when I have to tell people 'this may not be for you.' It's easy when I see someone who's just way off base, but when I see someone who comes in committed, works to be a teacher, then that's hard to say."

> "Yes, but I think it would be a very extreme case in which I would be certain that they should not qualify."

Some of the bipolar distribution observed in the quantitative data can be seen here. Those who recognize they have the power and are willing to yield it try initally to use counseling procedures with the students. Those who ultimately decline to use the power also engage in counseling strategies.

III. Reflections

Most people found it difficult to define a teacher educator. In general, the comments related to the act of teaching and not to any theoretical aspects of the role. It seems that *teacher educators generally identify with the semi-profession of teaching rather than the true profession of the professoriat.*

Generally one could conclude that there was an absence of a *well defined philosophy for teacher education.* None of the group cited any theoretical or research framework for the philosophy or viewpoints held.

The people who have been more directly and more extensively linked with classroom teaching appear to be prepared to act as gatekeeper to the profession. *The high level of identity these people feel with teachers may permit them to feel a responsibility to control entry into the profession.*

WHAT DOES A TEACHER EDUCATOR DO?

The traditional three categories within which the university faculty members consider their activities are teaching, scholarly contributions, and service. These three categories will form the framework for this discussion.

I. Quantitative Data

A. Teaching

A major consideration when addressing the question, "What does a teacher educator do?", is the relative amount of time spent on different activities. Each person was shown a list of activities commonly undertaken by teacher educators and each was asked to identify the two or three on which they spent most time. Table 27 summarizes the results. Most people indicated that they spent a large proportion of their time in teaching activities. This included, not only the direct contact in the classroom, but the time spent preparing for class, grading papers and meeting with individual students from their classes. Three of the 28 interviewees reported spending much of their time in the supervision of student teachers.

In recent years there has been considerable attention paid to the location where undergraduate education courses are held. For many years undergraduate methods courses were taught on the university campuses. Recently, there has been a shift in work location and many methods courses are now field-based. This may

TABLE 27

Number of Persons Stating Activities
Among Those on Which Much of Their Time is Spent

N = 28

Teaching undergraduate classes	20
Teaching graduate classes	17
Developing learners or classroom materials	4
Supervising student teachers	3
Serving on dissertation committees	5
Conducting research	9
Publishing	10
Conducting inservice activities	5
Participating in professional organization	5
Serving on university committees	10
Service to the community	2

mean that the entire class is taught in a public school classroom, or it may mean that part of the instruction is carried out in that location and part is taught on campus. Table 28 indicates the distribution of the sample with respect to the location where the courses are taught. Most persons in this sample either had mixed location for their classes or taught largely on campus. These data, however, reflect both graduate and undergraduate teaching and thus do not relate exclusively to the role of the teacher educator as defined for this study. The marked difference in location for the all-level teacher educators is created by the inclusion within that category of the media faculty who teach all of their required courses on campus. The frequent assertion that assistant professors teach a disproportionate number of field courses does not appear accurate.

B. Scholarly contributions

When presented with the list of activities commonly undertaken by teacher educators, slightly less than half the group indicated that they spent a large proportion of their time on research and publication (Table 27), although "publish or perish" has for years been a phrase describing university life. In the interview the question was posed, "Do you feel a pressure to publish?". Table 29 reports these data. The general perception is supported with only full professors, who received their doctoral degree prior to 1970, feeling no pressure. It should not be inferred from this that those persons do not publish, the data merely say they do not feel themselves to be pressured to do so. All participants stated that they did publish.

TABLE 28

A Location for Courses Taught

N = 28

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. Before to 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Completely field based	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
Primarily field based	4	3	1	0	4	0	1	3	4	0	0
Mixed	10	7	3	3	6	1	3	7	7	1	2
Primarily campus based	5	3	2	1	3	1	2	3	4	1	0
Completely campus based	7	4	3	3	3	1	3	4	3	0	4

TABLE 29

Perceived Extent of Pressure Felt to Publish

N = 25

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1970	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Great	6	2	4	4	2	0	1	5	3	2	1
Some	16	11	5	3	12	1	6	10	12	0	4
Little	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
None	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0

C. Service

In the list of activities commonly undertaken by teacher educators, there was little indication that much time was spent on service activities (Table 27). Apart from this no quantitative data were collected with respect to service activities. Comments, however, were made which will be reported in the section on qualitative data.

II. Qualitative data

A. Teaching

Teaching is the activity teacher educators state as being the part of their university life they like most and from which they feel they gain the greatest reward. This attraction derives from their interaction with students and the opportunity presented to help others.

> Interacting with students is to me extremely exciting, whether it's in groups, whether it's as individuals, whether it's undergraduates, whether it's graduates. An interaction which focuses on some intellectual area of interest and excitement is just the most fascinating thing that one does. I find teaching an endlessly creative endeavor."

> "Oh, just working with people. . .You have affected their lives in terms of what they do and how they go about doing it. In a sense you've helped them."

This is particularly relevant when the student teaching phase is being considered.

B. Scholarly contributions

Certainly scholarly contributions, defined generally as con-

ducting research and publishing, are seen as essential parts of the life of the teacher educator.

> "Pressure to publish comes from the fact that you're signed on in a major institution, and the role description there is that you influence, and that you will make contributions, and nobody knows a contribution unless you put it in print somewhere."

The notion that publication is essential for a contribution to be recognized is linked to the point of view that,

> "Unless research is published it's of no consequence and consequently research and publication must be considered together."

Generally the teacher educators interviewed believed that the major reason for their not publishing as much as either the university or they themselves wished is lack of time.

> "I'd like to have the freedom to devote an extensive amount of time over several semesters to research."

Research and publication is desirable to meet personal as well as institutional needs.

> "I would like to do more research so that it, in turn, could influence my own teaching."

> "I've always enjoyed publishing. . .there's no problem publishing. . . .If I had a hobby, it would be one of my hobbies. I like to write."

C. Service

Generally, service was construed by the group of people interviewed on a parochial basis. Few reflected the same viewpoint as the person who said,

> "I think service is a service to the profession, service which means going out and carrying the University of ---- flag to the world."

Generally service on campus was seen from one of two extreme viewpoints.

> "Service: it's a hassle."

Or, in response to the question, "What aspects of your role would you like to change?"

> "Get rid of all the service stuff! Get off all committees immediately! Like tomorrow!"

Others are concerned with the life of the organization--the university.

> "I'm very active politically and administratively within the university, in committee work and so on. . . .I see that as working towards, or working for the health of the organism known as the university."

Certainly these comments are consistent with the rewards that the participants stated they experienced when they were classroom teachers.

One person reflected concerns implied by many of the participants.

> ". . .we waste a lot of time. We're dedicated to field-based instruction for undergraduates. We think that's where effectiveness is. . .and actually what happens is that you can't document that effectiveness."

The unpopularity of spending large amounts of time on the road and in the school seems not to rise from a concern over time used but rather because of a basic questioning of the entire notion that

field-based teaching is the most effective. This is closely related to another concern which questions whether university faculty should be involved in this field-based education or whether that phase of instruction would not more appropriately rest in the domain of classroom teachers themselves.

> "I'd have less field-based education. . . .My position is that university people should do what they can do best and that's not to go into public schools and tell people what to do. . . .It seems that public school people are far more competent to do some things than those of us who teach at the university. There should be a separation of responsibilities."

> "I think that if we ever expect to make it with the legislature, we've got to increase our service to the community. But here again we've got to remember that as a major research institution we can't provide service at the expense of research."

These viewpoints only serve as reflections of the great variety of persons who rest within a diverse community such as a university faculty.

III. Reflections

While the participants were involved in all three of the traditionally university faculty roles *most of their time was spent in teaching*. Some need was expressed to determine which are the most effective formats for teaching preservice teachers.

The two aspects of scholarly contribution, research and publication, absorbed a significant proportion of the faculty members' time. They believed that *conducting research must be*

accompanied by publication; only then is research of value.

The reaction to service was varied. Those persons who spent considerable time in those activities saw the service as important for the well-being of the organization. *Many participants viewed service activities as preventing them from engaging in research and publication.*

WHAT DOES A TEACHER EDUCATOR SEE AS SOURCES OF INFLUENCE UPON HIM OR HER?

It is an obvious fact, even to the point of being a truism, that environmental factors differentially influence the actions of individuals. Teacher educators are not atypical in this respect. In this study an attempt was made to identify some variables that might explain individual differences. The selected environmental factors were classified into three categories:

a. personal influences

b. campus influences

c. off campus influences.

I. Quantitative Data

When the relative strength of the three categories, personal, campus and off campus were compared, the data presented in Table 30 were compiled. No person recognized off campus influences as the single greatest influence upon their activities. Half, however, identified either personal or campus influences as the strongest source of pressure.

A. Personal Influence

A personal influence was defined as any influence from the individual faculty member and not from an outside force. Originally this had not been identified as a major source of influence to be considered in this investigation but the first round of interviews quickly demonstrated that this was a strong source. Although

TABLE 30

Primary Source of Influence Upon the Teacher Educator

N = 27

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Personal	10	6	4	2	7	1	4	5	9	0	1
Campus	10	6	4	6	3	1	2	8	5	3	2
Off campus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mixed	7	6	1	0	5	2	3	4	5	0	2

one half only of the sample indicated themself to be the strongest source of influence on their activities, a larger number regarded it as a strong source.

When one considered rank as a variable, some variation could be observed. Four of the eight assistant professors, twelve of the fourteen associate and three of the four professors indicated themselves as a strong source of influence. At least half of the persons within each of these groups reported this strong personal pressure, but there was increasing evidence of it with increasing rank. It can be suggested that once the pressure exerted by the campus forces on the faculty member has subsided, they recognized themselves as a strong source of influence upon their activities.

Another variable which appeared to have some differentiating effect upon the extent of self imposed pressure was that of the faculty members' location for teaching--campus, mixed or field based. Ten of the twelve campus based faculty, six of the ten mixed based faculty and two of the five field based faculty indicated that personal pressure was a strong influence on their activities. Those persons spending most of their time on campus obviously recognized this personal source of influence to have greater power than those spending large amounts of time in the public schools. The location for teaching assignment did not correlate with rank.

The frequency with which internal pressure was mentioned by this group of persons is certainly significant.

B. On Campus Influences

Two major sources of influence were considered: the departmental promotion and salary committee and the central university administration. All of the assistant professors identified the departmental committee as a strong influence whereas only one of them referred to the central university administration. Of the fourteen associate professors, six saw the departmental committee as a strong influence but twelve referred to the central university administration. The one professor who referred to influences outside him: it saw both the department and the central university administration as important. An obvious change in force is thus exerted by these two groups; as a source of perceived influence upon faculty the departmental committee decreases and the central university administration increases with professorial rank.

When the second variable, location for teaching classes was considered, some differences were observed. Five of the twelve campus based faculty, eight of the ten mixed based faculty and one of the five field based faculty members named the departmental committee as a strong source of influence. Seven of the campus based, six of the mixed based and one of the field based faculty members identified the central university administration as a source of influence. This would suggest, that if one is largely off campus, its influence is perceived as low. The small number of persons in this sample, however, cause one to be very reluctant to draw conclusions.

C. Off Campus Influences

From the interviews four off campus sources were recognized as having the most influence upon the activities of faculty members. The frequency with which outside groups were perceived as having influence upon the activities of the faculty members is reported in Table 31 by rank and Table 32 by teaching location. Generally, the associate professors appear to be influenced to a greater extent than either of the other two groups with the exception of the influence of professional organizations upon full professors. Campus based faculty perceived greater influence than field based faculty members from national professional organizations, federal and state government and accrediting and certification agencies. The reverse ordering occurred with respect to the influence of public school personnel.

II. Qualitative Data

A. Personal Influences

The influence, or pressure, exerted by the individual was expressed in different ways.

> "I don't feel pressure from without. I feel a tremendous amount of pressure from within. I feel a real drive to contribute in certain ways and I'm harder on myself than anybody else has been hard on me."

> "I feel more pressure from myself than I feel through anybody on the outside....The pressures are my own. I mean the fact that I come in on seven days or six days a week, work at night or whatever, these are my internal pressures....I'm forcing myself."

TABLE 31

Frequency with Which External Forces are Perceived as a Source of Influence by Rank

	Assistant Professors N = 8	Associate Professors N = 14	Professors N = 4
National Professional organizations	3	9	3
Public school personnel	3	4	2
Federal and state government	2	10	1
Accrediting and certification agencies	1	5	0

TABLE 32

Frequency With Which External Forces are Perceived as a Source of Influence by Teaching Location

	On campus N = 12	Mixed N = 10	Field N = 5
National professional organization	6	7	1
Public school personnel	1	4	5
Federal and state government	8	5	0
Accrediting and certification agencies	6	3	0

The expectations of the family to achieve have shaped the actions of some.

> "I've always given myself plenty to do, trying to fulfill the family dream."

Others respond to the influence because of their high ego - a characteristic of many members of the group.

> "I feel an immense amount of pressure, but not from administrative or pressure groups particularly. The pressure that I feel is a need to get what I have done published so that I get credit for what I've done before everybody else does it....My ego is very strong."

Regardless of the source these comments are all strong support for the quantitative data which indicate a high level of personal influence.

B. Campus Influences

The trends reflected in the quantitative data with respect to the differential effect of campus influences on different professorial ranks can also be observed through qualitative data.

An assistant professor said,

> "The departmental promotion and salary committee is the major influence in my life right now, because they control whether I'll have a job in the future, and they also have been important because they've done a lot of good things as well."

The problem for many assistant professors is learning the structure at the university and the sources of influence, that is becoming socialized.

> "An assistant professor is for the most part learning where the power structures are. I have found out that there is a very strong political

> System here, not only at the university level, but right in the department. I have experienced very unpleasant moments learning that."

Another assistant professor who had not been at the institution for as long stated,

> "Well, I haven't quite figured that out.... Certainly at the department level, the promotion and salary committee has a folklore built around it whether or not it is true. They seem to have a lot of power. I don't know whether or not the president has power. I really don't know. I haven't figured it out yet."

At the tenured level some have a clearly defined perception of the influence structure on campus.

> "I'm more concerned though about the administration, the chairman, the deans, vice presidents, president and that chain. I'm more concerned about them than I am any other power or influence group that might exist on campus. I think those people are the people that really count."

Others who are tenured recognize that there are influence groups but they are not influenced by them. They may not be rewarded by them but they still do not respond to their influence.

> "There are no power groups on campus that influence me. I don't feel pressured at all. I feel thwarted by the system. That is to say there seems to be no way to shake it and change it to get it focused on some things I'm interested in."

> "I really think that I've convinced myself that I can be perfectly happy at the rank I am and do the job I want to do, earn enough money to be comfortable, and not have it bother me that some people who are no more able that I am are full professors."

C. Off Campus Influences

Few comments were made of a subjective type with respect to

these categories of influence. The data collected were based on a series of forced answer questions. Two comments highlight the concerns of some faculty members who have some, but not large, field based responsibilities.

> "...We are constantly working uphill, making sure that we offend no one, and that we will do nothing that will cause concern or anxiety about our presence. This works very much against any change..."

> "School district personnel and administrators have a real influence...because if nothing else they kick us out so we have to compromise."

These persons apparently see the limiting aspect of public school influence which they perceive as precluding them from conducting the type of program they desire.

III. Reflections

Four themes seem to be of interest in this section and worthy of further analysis.

The decline in influence of the departmental promotion and salary committee with rank is probably because the only influence that the departmental committee has upon the full professors is with respect to salary increases, and since the salary distribution is relatively flat, the pressure exerted upon this highest rank by the departmental committee is small. An alternative explanation is that, along with higher rank comes a perception that much of the policy is made at a higher level of the university administration. The departmental committee is important only as it carries

out the policy; thus it is perceived as having little influence. Since the same departmental committee, through indirect means, guides much of the program planning within the department, the *perceptions of the departmental salary and promotion committee held by the senior professors may be detrimental to the growth of the department as a unit.*

The greatest awareness of the central university administration as a source of influence is present among associate professors. Some associates see it as being a political structure in which they personally can, and do, get involved. Other associate professors see it as a clear step in the decision making of the entire university - questions are posed regarding the decisions made by the central administration related to different departments and different faculty roles. Presumably, it would be *associate professors who would be most responsive to change or goal setting initiated by the central administration of a university.*

A dramatic difference can be observed in the perceived influence of the federal and state government. The associate professors recognize government as an important source of influence because of its financial allocations which impact faculty members in two ways. First, research and development grants are awarded by the federal government directly to faculty members. Second the government identifies priority areas in the public schools for change and in turn forces teacher educators

to make programmatic changes. One example cited was the extension of government interest from reading exclusively to include other language arts. The fact that the full professors did not see the federal government as a source of influence seems strange and may be the result of the extremely small sample interviewed at that rank or it may reflect a limited involvement in grant writing and program development by that professorial rank. The trend indicates that, *the activities of associate professors may reflect the extent to which an institution responds to changing forces external to the campus.*

With increased rank there is an increase in power and type of influence of national professional organizations. Those assistant professors who expressed being influenced by national professional organizations saw the influence in the form of an arena in which to present papers - they did not express the influence as a source of collegial interaction. Associate professors, however, see the professional organizations as important for setting research directions, for collegial interaction and for personal growth. Professors tend to express the influence in terms of their own active involvement as office holders. In general, those persons who became active in a national network in the early stages of their university career were those persons who, in the description of their graduate training, referred to an involvement with faculty members in professional activities. Those people who were involved in graduate school also appeared to learn

the influence patterns on campus more quickly and thus suffer less confusion at a critical stage in their career. *The socialization process began while in graduate school.*

The varying effects and sources of influence on faculty members is a critical element, not only in the development of the individual teacher educator as a person, but also as a member of the organization of which they are a part.

WHAT ARE THE PROFESSIONAL VALUES HELD BY THE TEACHER EDUCATOR?

It is difficult to gain accurate insight into the values of any group of persons. For this investigation, some sense of the values of teacher educators was gained by considering:

A. teacher educators' perceived value of selected activities by 1) teacher educators and 2) the university.

B. stated goals and desires of teacher educators.

C. aspects of teacher educators' role in the university enjoyed most and least.

I. Quantitative Data

A. A teacher educators' perceived value of selected activities

The activities to be considered are discussed in three categories; teaching, scholarly contributions, and service. Consistencies and discrepancies between values held by the teacher educators interviewed and those held by the university as perceived by the teacher educators are presented.

1. Teaching

One has to remember the reference group being considered in this study - persons who have taught at least one undergraduate required course during the past two academic years. Nothing is included in the definition regarding graduate teaching or inservice activities. Table 33 summarises the data relating to perceived values of specific teaching activities. The members of the sample perceived that the university placed less value on undergraduate

TABLE 33

Summary Data of Perceived Relative Value of Teaching Activities by University and Teacher Educator

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
I. Undergraduate courses											
U* > TE	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
U = TE	10	6	4	3	5	2	4	6	5	2	3
U < TE	16	10	6	4	10	2	6	10	12	1	3
Do not know	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
II. Graduate courses											
U > TE	7	6	1	2	3	2	3	4	4	1	2
U = TE	17	9	8	5	11	1	6	11	13	2	2
U < TE	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	0	1
Do not know	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
III. Supervising student teachers											
U > TE	4	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1
U = TE	6	4	2	2	3	1	3	3	4	0	2
U < TE	16	11	5	4	10	2	5	11	13	1	2
Do not know	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
IV. Developing learning or classroom material											
U > TE	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
U = TE	13	8	5	5	7	1	4	9	9	2	2
U < TE	13	9	4	3	7	3	6	7	9	1	3
Do not know	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0

*U refers to the university as an organizational system

teaching and the supervision of student teachers than did they. The reverse was true with respect to graduate courses. These trends appear consistent across all the variables considered. There appears to be a greater perceived consensus between the university and the teacher educators with respect to the preparation of instructional materials for classes. An equal number of persons, however, perceived the university as placing less value upon that activity than do they. Particular caution should be exerted when using the last finding in that there was ambiguity as to the meaning of instructional materials.

2. Scholarly contributions

Findings related to the two major examples of scholarly contributions, research and publications, are summarised in Table 34. Equivalent value is perceived to be placed on conducting research by both the university and the faculty. A slight skew, however, does exist toward the university placing greater value on this activity than the faculty. Although a similar trend as that for research is observed with respect to publication, there is an indication that a greater discrepancy exists between the two value systems. The discrepancy is least among assistant professors and those persons receiving their doctorate since 1969. When one considers both conducting research and publishing, one can infer that teacher educators perceive that actually doing research is of high value on its own merits. The value of research does not solely rest in the conveying of knowledge to the outside world

TABLE 34

Summary Data of Perceived Relative Value of Scholarly Activities by University and Teacher Educator

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
I. Conducting research											
U* > TE	9	6	3	2	5	2	4	5	7	2	0
U = TE	16	10	6	5	9	2	6	10	11	1	4
U < TE	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	1
Do not know	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
II. Publishing											
U > TE	14	9	5	3	9	2	7	7	9	2	3
U = TE	9	7	2	4	3	2	3	6	6	1	2
U < TE	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0
Do not know	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0

*U refers to the university as an organizational system

through the act of publication.

3. Service

Three facets of service were considered: university committees, professional organizations, and inservice activities. Their perceived relative values are displayed in Table 35. In general there is agreement in the values held by the teacher educators, and that which they perceive the university hold in respect to university committee work. An interesting exception occurs among the associate professors who see the university placing more value on this activity than they do themselves. This has to be considered in conjunction with the perceived power of the central administration upon associate professors and the extent of their involvement in campus wide activities. When considered as a whole group, most of the people interviewed saw the university and themselves placing the same value on activities in professional organizations. There is a great amount of discrepancy when the value placed on inservice training is considered. Here, the university is perceived as placing less value on it than the teacher educators. Assistant professors, females, and those receiving their doctorate since 1969 are in greater agreement with the university administration than other subgroups of the sample.

In total there were nine categories of activities considered in this comparison of perceived values. Table 36 displays the frequency with which individuals within the sample concurred in their own value of the activities and the value they perceived

TABLE 35

Summary Data of Perceived Relative Value of Service Activities by University and Teacher Educator

	Total	M	F	A.	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
I. University committee											
U* > TE	11	7	4	2	7	2	3	8	9	1	1
U = TE	9	6	3	5	2	2	3	6	5	2	2
U < TE	5	3	2	0	5	0	3	2	3	0	2
Do not know	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
II. Professional organization											
U > TE	2	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	0
U = TE	14	6	8	5	8	1	4	10	12	1	1
U < TE	9	8	1	2	4	3	4	5	4	2	3
Do not know	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
III. Inservice training											
U > TE	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1
U = TE	8	2	6	4	3	1	1	7	5	2	1
U < TE	11	9	2	2	7	2	5	6	9	0	2
Do not know	4	3	1	1	2	1	3	1	2	1	1

*U refers to the university as an organizational system

TABLE 36

Summary of Perceived Relative Value of University and Teacher Educator, i.e. Number of Times of Equivalent Value

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
0-3	6	4	2	0	5	1	2	4	5	0	1
4-7	18	12	6	8	8	2	7	11	11	3	4
8-9	3	1	2	0	2	1	1	2	3	0	0

the university as possessing. The greatest proportion agreed with respect to four to seven of the nine activities. Only three persons showed greater level of agreement. Almost one fourth (6) indicated that they only agreed with respect to zero to three of the activities.

B. Stated goals and desires of teacher educators

The data collected to address this question do not lead themselves to quantitative analysis. A discussion of the qualitative data will be presented in the appropriate section.

C. Aspects of teacher educators' role in the university enjoyed most and least

Values of teacher educators can be inferred from the statements made regarding the aspects of their role they find to be most and least enjoyable. Table 37 displays the data regarding those activities enjoyed most. Almost half indicated student interaction as the preferred factor, with six of the 28 stating that the freedom they experienced was valuable. Of the six in the latter group five were male; one was an assistant professor. The findings are consistent with the responses gained from posing the question, "What did you like best about schoolteaching?" Nineteen of the respondents then stated student interaction (Table 38). Similar distributions were observed in response to the question, "What do you like least about college teaching?". Half of the participants identified the bureaucracy as the aspect they liked least (Table 39) and five the political features of university life. Again, a similar trend was apparent when the corresponding

TABLE 37

Factors Liked Best While College Teaching

N = 27

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Student interaction	13	9	4	4	7	2	4	3	10	1	2
Collegial interaction	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Freedom	6	5	1	1	4	1	2	4	5	0	1
Research	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Work with knowledge	4	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2
Participation in profession	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Other	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0

TABLE 38

Characteristics Liked Best While School Teachers

N = 25

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Student interaction	19	13	6	3	13	3	6	13	17	1	1
Collegial interaction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Work with knowledge	4	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
Other	2	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0

TABLE 39

Factors Liked Least While College Teaching

N = 26

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Bureaucracy	14	11	3	2	10	2	6	8	9	0	5
Lack of collegial interaction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of student scholarship	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Lack of professional scholarship	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Politics	5	3	2	2	2	1	2	3	5	0	0
Diversity of activities	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	0
Pressure to publish	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Other	3	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0

question was posed regarding their schoolteaching experience. Eleven identified the bureaucracy when schoolteaching as the least liked aspect (Table 40). The teacher educators interviewed enjoy student related aspects of their professional life and dislike the constraints imposed by that which is viewed as the bureaucratic aspects of the organization.

II. Qualitative Data

A. Teacher educators' perceived value of selected activities

The qualitative data yielded little more information beyond that reported in the quantitative data section. The strength with which some of the values were held could be inferred. Several persons referred to the perceived low value placed on student teaching by the university as opposed to the high value placed on it by the teacher educator.

> "It certainly doesn't get you anywhere. . . the university doesn't think it's very important. I do. I enjoy it. I haven't supervised student teachers since I've been here. . . .I would do it, but I am reluctant to because of its low prestige."

Those who saw the institution placing more value on research than they, recognized the reason for the university's position.

> "This is a major research institution, they place great emphasis there, much more than I would."

In certain instances the opinion is held that equal value is placed on an activity by both the institution and the individual teacher

TABLE 40

Characteristics Liked Least While School Teaching

N = 25

	Total	M	F	aP	AP	P	Ph.D. before 1970	Ph.D. after 1969	Elem.	Sec.	All Level
Bureaucracy	11	7	4	2	8	1	3	8	8	1	2
Scheduling	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0
Lack of collegial professionals	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	0
Lack of student scholarship	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Lack of intellectual stimulation	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
Other	7	4	3	1	3	3	5	1	6	1	0

educator but for very different reasons.

> "It's about the same but in some areas there are considerable differences. There are professional organizations that are local, and the university does not give much credence to those. There are national and international ones that they tend to attach a great amount of importance to. They attach quite a bit of importance to serving on major steering groups and research panels, but much less in terms of participating as a person who goes to learn something or to give a paper."

The variation in perceived relative value permeates many of the comments made by interviewees.

B. Stated goals and desires of teacher educators

The goals expressed by participants related to two areas of activity--research and teaching. One person, when describing goals held on coming to the institution first and those held at the present, stated:

> "I suppose that what I wanted to do was get a program of my own research underway. I think that is still my goal--it guides most of what I do and will try to do outside of my classroom obligations."

The following comment was typical of the goals articulated regarding teaching.

> ". . .I wanted to teach and motivate my students in such a way that they would want to teach science to kids. That was my goal when I came to this university and basically it still is."

An integration of both research and teaching was stated by one person.

> "My primary function I see as improving instruction, improving children's learning. My primary way of doing that is by effecting the quality of teaching. I can do that by imparting what I know to people who are going to be or are teachers, or I can conduct research so that I learn more about instruction. I see the research that I do as fundamental to teacher education as the courses that I teach."

Whether it was research or teaching, many people saw a need for greater collaboration.

> "I'd like to have more collaboration with colleagues."

> "I'd like most of all to change away from the role of individual professor teaching an individual course, to the role of a professor working with a team on a group of concerns."

There were those who saw that their goals focused on off campus activities rather than on the campus.

> "My major commitment has been to a field which is larger than any institution. . . .I have an allegiance to the University of ----- but I have more stronger alliances to the field of knowledge and the general professional field."

C. Aspects of teacher educators' role in the university enjoyed most and least

There is support in the qualitative data for the findings discussed in the quantitative section. Above all, most people enjoy teaching.

> "There are some things I think it's important for people to do, but I don't particularly like doing. Teaching is not one of them. It's one I like to do a lot."

Talking to individual students is highly prized by this group of persons. This is reflected in the following comment made in relation to talking with students during difficult periods of student teaching.

> "The thing I like best about college teaching is talking to individual students. . . .When you talk with someone and realize when that student leaves your office, whether you were able to help him or not, that he realizes there's somebody who cares in the university. That really charges me up."

The stimulation of teaching undergraduate students was mentioned on several occasions.

> "You can expect a lot of students, you can interact with them at a collegial level even though they may be undergraduate students."

Other persons value their interaction with graduate students.

> "The greatest rewards I get are from working directly with graduate students. . . .I get satisfaction in working with graduate students in their research and seeing them mature and utilize their knowledge and abilities in really meaningful contexts. . . .I know where each of the graduate students goes (after graduate work) and what they do. . . .I retain those relationships."

Service activities are disliked, not because of the activities themselves, but rather because of the time consumed on such activities.

> "I believe that we all have to share in the governance of this institution, but the efficiency factors could be improved. I believe it's one of the colossal wastes of everybody's time."

III. Reflections

Persons inverviewed reflected a considerable amount of dissonance between what they value, and what they believe the institution values. *This dissonance may lead to stress accompanied by a fragmentation of efforts.*

Teaching as an activity is considered paramount. The greatest reward of it appears to be the high level of student interaction that is possible. Lortie (1975) concluded that schoolteachers value student interaction as a reward for their teaching in the absence of other significant rewards. *Even though the university does have a reward system, many teacher educators personally retain the reward system of an earlier phase in their career.*

A certain amount of conflict can be observed between the value expressed for collaboration among teacher educators and the value placed on their individual activities. *The freedom afforded by the university to the faculty to pursue their own interests is valued highly and may preclude the level of collegiality stated as desirable by some teacher educators.*

CONCLUSIONS

From this limited study several themes can be discerned for which further data are needed in order to establish credibility. Limited as the study is, however, it does shed some light on the current status of one group of teacher educators.

When one considers the prior experiences of teacher educators, one can see roots of some of the tensions felt in dealing with the basic reward system of the university. The precollegiate and collegiate experiences of teacher educators have generally been marked with success. Few significant career decisions have been confronted by these persons. They happen to become teachers, and later teacher educators; they generally do not make deliberate decisions to become teachers or teacher educators. Entry into both roles was eased; there was no stringent gatekeeping activity. As a teacher they were subjected to very little, if any, evaluation. Their rewards were generally self-given as opposed to conferred by an outside group (Lortie, 1975). Once a university faculty member, the situation changes dramatically. There is a reward system structured by a group of persons with whom the teacher educators do not readily identify. In order to gain the rewards of this system, they are held accountable for their actions; before tenure is awarded, there is a stringent checkpoint based on criteria not necessarily valued by many teacher educators. This situation clearly leads to a considerable amount of frustration and anxiety felt strongly by assistant professors and to a lesser

extent by associate professors.

A related problem is that of the role of the teacher educator within the university. There is a strong bond that links the teacher educator with the public schools. This bond is strongest among the senior members of the faculty, who have spent a considerable portion of their professional life in the schools. They recognize the intensity of life in that arena. They made significant and valued contributions there. Because of this bond, they find it very difficult to shift their value system from that of the public schools to that of the university. Junior faculty members are not so closely linked to the public schools. They did not teach as long and did not derive much positive reinforcement there. They hold a value system which is more consistent with that of the university. Whereas many senior faculty see the schools as a place where important activities occur, many junior faculty see the importance of a research center where a strong theoretical framework for teaching and teacher education can be developed. This does not mean that junior faculty do not respect teachers, they do indeed. But, they see different contributions coming from the two organizations. This shift of identity among teacher educators is one of significance and effects the activities of the group, its expectations, and its values.

It is not only with respect to identity that junior and senior faculty differ. When one compares those persons who received their doctorates prior to 1970 and those who earned

doctorates since 1969, one finds the latter group comes from slightly higher socioeconomic backgrounds and smaller families. Their career paths have been marked with a more singular focus and with greater emphasis on academic fields. They generally attended only one undergraduate college where they pursued a major in an academic area. In their graduate work, and as faculty members, they are somewhat specialized. This is reflected in the courses they teach, the research they conduct, the journals they read, and the conventions they attend. The junior faculty tend, therefore, to possess a more specialized background than their senior colleagues. In this way, they reflect the more general character of university professors.

A source of concern to persons interested in program development for teacher education is the lack of a well defined knowledge base for teaching. Most of the decision making regarding courses and programs is based on personal experience and in particular on field activities. There is a general lack of well conceived plans. If the noted trend toward theory building among the junior faculty is indeed a fact and if that characteristic remains once those persons are tenured, then one may expect to see this lack of a delineable theory base eliminated. There is also the possibility that the current climate surrounding education and the pressures being imposed from many sources may cause all involved in teacher education to recognize the need for a well defined knowledge base and to respond to it. There is already considerable research

which can be used as a base for such a framework.

This study is limited both because of the single campus character and the small sample. It is important that it be extended to consider other campuses including universities not considering research as their primary mission, and small liberal arts colleges which prepare students for certification. The wider definition of teacher educator should not be forgotten. School based teacher educators, including cooperating teachers and staff development persons, service or teacher center personnel, and faculty in the academic areas should be included. When considering this larger population, questionnaires could be used to collect the basic data, and telephone interviews could be used to gain more in-depth information. By this means, themes which are presented in this report and which could only be treated in a superficial manner could be addressed in greater depth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Becker, H.S. Interviewing medical students. American Journal of Sociology, 1956, 62, 199-201.

Erickson, F. Mere ethnography: Some problems in its use in educational practice. Occasional Paper #13. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1979.

Etzioni, A. The Semi-professions and their organization. New York: Free Press, 1969.

Fenstermacher, G. D. What needs to be known about what teachers need to know. In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.). Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1980.

Fuller, F. F. Concerns of Teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 207-226.

Glaser, R. Trends and research questions in psychological research on learning and schooling. Educational Researcher, 1979, 8(10), 6-13.

Guba, E. G. & Clark, D. L. Are schools of education languishing? New York University Education Quarterly, 1978, 9(2), 9-16.

Hall, G. H. A national agenda for research and development in teacher education, 1979-1984. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1979.

Henry, N. B. (Ed.). Education for the professions, 61st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Jackson, P. W. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Lortie, D. C. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Merton, R. K., Fiske, M. & Kendall, P.L. The focused interview: A manual of problems and procedures. Glencoe, Il.: The Free Press, 1956.

Riecken, H. The unidentified interviewer. American Journal of Sociology, 1956, 62, 210-219.

Rist, R. C. On qualitative research: Issues of design, implementation, analysis, ethics and applicability, Unpublished bibliography. Ithaca, N.Y.: College of Human Ecology, Cornell University, 1979.

APPENDIX A

FIRST INTERVIEW GUIDE

PHASE I

INTERVIEW OF TEACHER EDUCATORS

1. To begin, would you tell us a little bit about your personal background up until the time you entered college? Would you include date and place of birth, your family background, your parents' occupations, and brief descriptions of your elementary and secondary schooling?

2. Are you a citizen of the United States?

3. Describe your family

   - size
   - structure
   - occupations of parents
   - how much and what type of support

4. Please describe the elementary, junior high and senior high schools you attended:

   a. U.S., foreign, American dependent school outside of U.S.
   b. population of community
   c. SES of the majority of students in your school if possible
   d. area -- inner city, urban, rural, etc.
   e. size of school
   f. your overall impression
   g. ethnic population
   h. class size

5. Describe your undergraduate work

   - type of institution(s)
   - degree(s) - major, minor
   - impression
   - dissertation topic

7. Were you ever a school teacher?

8. If you were a schoolteacher (need to define) please give the following information:

   a. level (subjects)
   b. size of school(s)
   c. size of community
   d. type of community
   e. SES of students
   f. public, private, church-affiliated, foreign
   g. description of role(s) you played

9. What did you like best while teaching in the (pre-collegiate) schools? What gave you the most reward?

10. What did you like least about teaching in the (pre-collegiate) schools?

11. Why did you leave teaching?

12. Describe the integration of your work experience and the collegiate work you have done. Did this effect your attitude toward your schooling?

13. How long have you been at UT-Austin?

14. What is your current faculty rank?

15. What reasons did you have for accepting a position here? Could you rank those factors according to importance?

16. Overall, how long have you been a college faculty member?

17. What do you like best about college teaching?

18. What do you like least about college teaching?

19. Which of the following types of students would you prefer to teach and why? (Alternatives presented on card.)

    - students in education courses, excluding student teaching
    - student teachers
    - students in graduate education courses
    - students in courses outside of the College of Education
    - inservice teachers
    - others
    - all types equally preferable

20. Do you consider yourself a teacher educator? Do you plan on becoming a teacher educator?

21. Do you consider it as your primary function? If not, what do you consider your primary function?

22. When did you decide to become a teacher educator? What were the circumstances surrounding your decision to become a college teacher - teacher educator? What persons of other factors influenced your decision?

23. Would you have preferred to enter into any other occupation?

24. What other options did you have, as far as occupation was concerned?

25. When you decided to become a teacher educator, what was your opinion of classroom teachers?

26. Do you think that you will remain a teacher educator? Why?

27. What would you do if you were fired? or lost your position?

28. When you decided to become a teacher educator, what role(s) did you expect to perform? What was expected of you?

29. When you accepted a position as a teacher educator, what did you expect to accomplish? What did you want/hope to accomplish?

30. Have you achieved these goals? If not, what hindered/prevented you from attaining your goals?

31. To what extent did the institution facilitate or prevent you from attaining your goals?

32. What or who do you consider to be the power groups on campus? Could you give some specific examples of ways in which they influence what you do or how you spend time? (positive and negative)

33. Do you consider the pressure to be very important or significant? Can you ignore it?

34. What do you think might happen in the university if you were not to follow the pressures of the groups you have identified?

35. Do you consider the extent of the pressure has changed in recent years? If so, why? How?

36. Do you consider this pressure to be about the same, less or greater on campus than in other phases of your life?

37. What do you do, as a teacher educator, that gives you the most reward?

38. Of all the things you do as a teacher educator

    - what do you do best?
    - what would you most like to do that you don't do now?

39. Which aspects of your role as a teacher educator would you like to change? Is there anything else?

40. Shown below is a list of some of the roles performed by teacher educators. Often there is a difference between the institution and the individual as to the importance attached to these roles.

    Please indicate whether the institution attaches more, the same, or less importance to these roles than you do. If you are unsure of the stand the institution takes, just indicate how important you feel it is.

    a. teaching undergraduate courses
    b. teaching graduate courses
    c. conducting research
    d. developing learning or classroom materials

e. supervising student teachers
f. conducting inservice training
g. serving on dissertation committees
h. serving on other committees
i. actively participating in professional organizations
j. service to the community
k. publishing

41. On which three or four items do you spend most of your time?

42. What do you do in your present position that you consider to be part of the teacher education program? ... to not be part of the teacher education program?

43. Who do you think makes the real decisions with respect to the teacher education programs here at UT-Austin?

44. Rank order the following with respect to

    a. real influence upon teacher education at UT
    b. competence to influence teacher education programs at UT (present alternatives on card)

        1. accreditation agencies
        2. federal government
        3. public school teachers, including unions
        4. school district and administrators
        5. university department of which you are a member
        6. professional organization, e.g., NCTE
        7. university faculty

45. What changes in teacher education programs would you like to make but which you feel you cannot make? What prevents you from making those changes?

46. Do you feel that it is your responsibility to advise a student not to enter the teaching profession if he/she is not qualified? (If not, whose responsibility is it? Does anyone have that responsibility? Should they?)

47. Are you <u>able</u> to prevent an unqualified candidate from receiving certification?

48. Do you feel pressured to publish? How? By whom?

49. What affect does research have on your teaching? Could you give concrete examples?

50. Define a teacher educator and say what qualifies one to be a teacher educator.

51. How much influence do you feel that you, as an individual, have on the future of teacher education?

APPENDIX B

SECOND INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. The amount of research in education is too much for anyone to keep up with. Who or what do you look to for synthesis and dissemination of research information important to you?

2. To which journals do you subscribe? Which ones do you use most?

3. To which conventions do you go regularly? Why? Would you go to other conventions if funds were available? Which?

4. What do you consider to be the high point for you of the last convention to which you went? If formal situation is given, then ask for informal, or the reverse.

5. Within the university, what collegial support do you have for your teaching? for your research?

6. If you had a sabbatical, what would you do?

7. Do you believe there should be some type of faculty or staff development program for teacher educators and, if so, what should its focus be?

8. How did you learn to teach? How common is it?

9. If you did not learn to teach in a college of Education, and many other teachers feel that they did not learn to teach in a college of Education, how may one justify the course work required of prospective teachers? What <u>unique</u> contribution does a prospective teacher receive in a college of Education which could be more valuable than the content work that teacher would receive in a degree program independent of the college of Education? To what extent can we teach someone to teach?

10. Could you describe some of your elementary and secondary

teacher who you thought were effective? How much of their style do you see reflected in yourself?

11. Recently there has been some research pointing to the effectiveness of direct instruction. What are your feelings about the findings? Would you say that it is reflected in your teaching of undergraduates and, if so, how? How/Where did you gain your knowledge of direct instruction?

12. How competent do you feel to teach others how to teach? Very competent--Why? How did you get that way? How do you keep it? Not very competent--Why? In what way? What can you do to correct it? What prevents you?

13. What type of training is appropriate to make someone an effective teacher educator? What type did you receive?

14. Most teacher educators have already taught in public schools. What additional skills does one need to teach others to teach, other than being a good elementary or secondary school teacher?

15. We are interested in looking at some of the developmental changes, on a professional level, which occur with teacher educators, and to see if these changes follow any type of pattern which may be intrinsic to teacher education. For example, you're an associate professor. What can you do as an AP that you couldn't do as an aP? What will you be able to do as a full professor that you can't do now? How else have your roles changed with increasing experience and rank? What new responsibilities have you gathered along the way?

16. How do you see yourself as being the same as other university

faculty members? How do you see yourself as being different?

17. How do you see yourself as being the same as an elementary or secondary school teacher? How do you see yourself as being different? (reverse point of view of #16 & 17 if time permits)

18. In your time as a teacher educator, what single thing has given you the most feeling of success? of frustration?

19. What is your philosophy for teacher education?

20. If you were granted the power to implement any single idea to improve the quality of teachers going into the field, what would it be? (at this university and generally)

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORMS

CONSENT TO ENGAGE IN RESEARCH STUDY

I have discussed with Heather Carter the research study she is conducting on teacher educators and I am willing to act as a participant in the study. I understand that all data she receives will be anonymous. Code numbers will be used in order to maintain this anonymity. The data will not be included in any files within the University and will not be used for any evaluation purposes. All interviews will be conducted by persons who agree to secrecy and who will provide a signed statement to indicate that fact when conducting the interview.

Participant _____

Investigator _____

Date _____

PRIVACY OF INTERVIEW DATA

I assure you that the data I collect in this interview will be available only under a code number. I will not discuss it using any identifiable factors. I will act with professional integrity in this research process.

Participant _____

Interviewer _____

Date _____